

REMARKS

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, Claims 19 and 21-29 will remain pending in the application. Claims 19 and 23 have been amended; Claims 1-18 and 20 have been canceled; and Claims 24-29 have been added. The newly added claims are supported by the specification at least in paragraph [0037] of the published application. These changes do not introduce new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action dated June 8, 2010, the Examiner sets forth a single ground for rejection, which is addressed in detail below.

Claim Objections

Claim 20 stands objected for the reasons set forth on page 2 of the Office Action. Claim 20 has been canceled and objection is now moot.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 19, 20 and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Andrews et al. (hereinafter “Andrews”) (U.S. Patent No. 6,936,248) for the reasons set forth on pages 2-3 of the Office Action. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d, 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

In this case, independent Claim 19, as amended, is directed to a method of inhibiting malignant cell migration in a host having a malignancy which is melanoma by administration of a migration-inhibiting effective amount of a composition containing anti CCL25 antibodies in a pharmaceutically acceptable carrier.

In contrast, Andrews generally mentions the inhibition of inflammatory processes by using an antibody that inhibits the binding of a ligand to GPR-9-6. Andrews does not teach or suggest treating a host with a migration-inhibiting effective amount of a composition containing anti-CCL25 antibodies in a pharmaceutically acceptable carrier. In fact, Andrews does not mention the migration of melanoma cells at all. Andrews generally mentions antagonism of the GPR-9-6 receptor as it pertains to inhibiting inflammatory processes, not the migration of melanoma cells as in the presently Claim 19.

Accordingly, Claim 19 is patentable over Andrews because Andrews does not teach every elements of Claim 19. Claims 22-29 are patentable because they depend from Claim 19 and recite additional patentable subject matter.

In view of the foregoing, the ground of rejection has been obviated and the withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

The stated ground of rejection has been properly traversed. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider the presently outstanding rejection and that it be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of the application, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' counsel, Ping Wang, M.D. (Reg. No. 48,328), at 202.842.0217.

Respectfully submitted,

MORRIS, MANNING & MARTIN, LLP



Ping Wang, M.D.
Registration No. 48,328

1333 H Street, N.W.
Suite 820
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone No. 202.842.0217
Facsimile No. 202.408.5146